Planning Services

Alberta

LEADERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT:

A REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS OF CONTEMPORARY THOUGHT

A literature review conducted by
Dr. Averlyn Pedro Gill and included as part of the appraisal of
The Alberta Academy for Educational Leadership conducted by:
L. W. Downey Research Associates, Ltd.

Under Contract To

ALBERTA EDUCATION
Edmonton, Alberta

February, 1987

LEADERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT:

A REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS OF CONTEMPORARY THOUGHT

This review of the literature on leadership and leadership development was conducted by Averlyn Pedro Gill in the Centre For Policy Studies In Education, the University of British Columbia, in 1986-87. Though Dr. Gill stopped short of any attempt to develop the comprehensive, integrative framework that she believes to be needed for a complete understanding of the phenomena called leadership, she has organized and presented her material in such a way as to invite the reader--researcher or practitioner--to develop his or her own conceptual framework. This work deserves further development. Meanwhile, we express appreciation to Dr. Gill for her preliminary and pioneering effort.

L.W. Downey

February, 1987

INTRODUCTION: APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP

The landscape of theoretical and empirical studies of leadership is littered with a diversity of conceptualizations of what leadership is and the attributes of persons who can exercise it. Amidst this diversity are some preliminary signs of progress toward the identification of the basic components of leadership (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). But progress toward their incorporation into comprehensive, integrative frameworks for understanding the phenomenon has been slow (Osborn et al., 1984; Quinn, 1984; Yukl, 1981: 291).

This article reviews selected theoretical and empirical studies of leadership. Two main questions provided the focus for the review: (1) What are the current ideas about what leadership is and what it does for an organization? and, (2) Whatever leadership is, to what extent can it be developed, and how?

From reviews of the literature on leadership, Bass (1981) and Yukl (1981) concluded that there is no best way to define leadership, for the phenomenon is complex and its meaning differs according to the objectives and assumptions of the researcher. In the 1980s, leadership research has continued to be dominated by approaches that conceptualize leaders and followers as a single unit. The underlying assumptions of the "unitary model" are: First, the leader and the followers function as a single unit, equivalent to that of a single biological organism. Second, the unit is basically cooperative. Conflict is not expected but, if it does occur, it is usually the result of divergent perceptions and cognitions rather than of divergent values or interests. Third, the goal of the unit is common to all and thus activity which is inconsistent with the common goal is dysfunctional and irrational. Fourth, issues of formal authority and formal organization override those of power and influence (Hosking et al., 1984: 419). Researchers who have

used the unitary perspective have acknowledged that, like every model, it is an oversimplification of reality, but it provides a good explanation at reasonable costs (Hunt, Hosking, Schriesheim and Stewart, 1984). Their critics have questioned the way in which the collective is collapsed under the properties of a single unit, which is often the leader--not a useful model for studies which consider structural, processual or contingency characteristics of the organization

Studies in which the "group model" of leadership has been proposed have focussed on group cohesive activities (Dachler, . 1984; Gardner et al., 1982; Leana, 1985; Osborn et al., 1984; Podsakoff and Todor, 1985). The group may be designated according to a formal chart or may emerge in the working out of issues or problems. The main assumption of this perspective is that goals are not specified in an absolute sense, but emerge out of trial and error or inter-group processes. These goals serve as symbols that build constituencies, define the limits of responsible action and integrate the group. The main limitations of these types of studies are the occurrences of bias in the assessments of aspects of the group's functioning (Binning, Zaba and Whattam, 1986; Larson, 1982; McElroy, 1982), methodological deficiencies (Gardner et al., 1982), and the predominance of group processes such as coalition formation, bargaining and negotiation, which may obscure the effects of the leadership function. It has been argued that the group perspective is useful because the focus of analysis on groups uncovers a deeper dimension of the organization.

Progress toward the development of a "macro-perspective" of leadership has been slow. A few researchers (Bass, 1981; Hunt and Osborn, 1982; Osborn et al., 1984; Quinn, 1984; Sekeran et al., 1982; Yukl, 1981) have demonstrated the importance of including the complex network of organizational, environmental, and other external influences in the study of leadership. The notion is that a reflective understanding of the events and processes by which intentions and plans are anticipated and adapted to the complex array of events

within and between organizations can give a greater insight into the complex social phenomenon of leadership. These types of studies consider the political, competitive and conflictual dimensions of leadership. An illustration of this type of leadership study has been proposed in the theoretical study of Osborn and colleagues. They defined leadership as the patterning of attention, activity, and reinforcement over time (Osborn et al., (1984). Thus, their unit of analysis can range from one individual to a set of individuals having leadership roles in the organization. Although this macro-approach to the study of leadership has been suggested as a reaction to the deficiencies of using either the unitary or the group perspective, it has been criticized for its neglect of the belief systems of those involved in the leadership process.

VIEWS OF LEADERSHIP

Differences in the level of analysis and in the conceptualization of the setting in which leadership occurs are not the only limitations on research. The different conceptions and narrow definitions which characterize research in this area suggest additional limitations. A review of the literature reveals, however, that many of the studies can be classified into one or more of three basic views: (1) leadership as antecedent conditions, (2) leadership as action, and (3) leadership outcomes.

1. Leadership As Antecedent Conditions

Antecedent conditions are conditions that set the stage for leadership action. They refer to the cognitive and psychological orientation of the leader and followers to the environment, and their traits, skills, abilities, and resources. In the leadership literature consideration of the traits and skills of the leader outweigh concerns for the resources of the leader and the followers and their cognitive and psychological orientation. Furthermore, research on the traits and skills of the leader is well established and outweighs

investigations of the followers' traits and skills. A peripheral area of concern is the orientation of the leader and the followers to the situation, despite the recognition that their beliefs, values, motivation and needs are of central relevance to the exercise of leadership.

Traditionally leadership has been viewed as the ability or capacity of a person to influence others or to control a situation in a way that he/she desires (Tosi, 1982: 404). The ability to exercise leadership is closely allied to a number of preexisting conditions to the actual manifestation of leadership. The literature dealing with antecedent conditions focusses on the characteristics of one or more of three basic components and their relationship to one another. These are the leader who initiates the leading action, the followers who are led and whose beliefs, values, assumptions and needs become congruent with the leader's wishes and undertakes action, and the situational context within which the leader and the followers operate in attempts to attain the goal. This group of studies, thus investigates the "sources of leadership" that arise out of one or more of these components, their characteristics, and interrelationships.

A number of basic skills have been identified as relevant to the exercise of leadership. They include human relations skills, technical skills, and conceptual skills. Their relative importance depends on the developmental stage of the leader-follower group, the type of group, and the nature of the situation. Yukl (1981) has identified eight antecedent conditions of leadership behaviour: (1) managerial motivation, (2) self confidence, (3) energy level, (4) emotional maturity, (5) technical skills, (6) human relations skills, (7) conceptual skills, and (8) physical skills. Yukl notes that managerial motivation, characterized by the desire for power, the desire to compete with peers, positive attitude toward authority figures, desire to see their group achieve challenging goals, and managerial skills in soliciting the commitment of subordinates to accomplish tasks are the most promising predictors of leadership outcomes. The cognitive skills that have been found to contribute

to the exercise of leadership include skills of (a) envisioning, that is, recognizing and developing followers' skills, maintaining a global perspective of the organization, forecasting the future, interpreting situations, and revising forecasts as changes occur (Argyris, 1983; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Mintzberg and Waters, 1983); (b) sense-making (Gioia, 1986; Kolb, 1983; Mitroff and Mason, 1983; Pondy, 1983; Quinn, 1980; Torbert, 1983); (c) acting thoughtfully, that is, acting reflectively, experimenting, taking risks and maintaining flexibility (Downey and Brief, 1986; Massarik, 1983; Schon, 1984; Weick, 1983); and (d) dialectical thinking, that is, contemplating at the same time a present and desired future state of affairs (Quinn, 1980). The trait of intelligence has not been ignored either. Simonton (1985) has developed a comprehensive conceptual framework consisting of four models that could be used to explain the curvilinear relationship that has been found to exist between intelligence and an individual's influence over other group members.

Another set of antecedent conditions are self managerial skills, skills associated with reducing deviation from existing standards (Manz, 1986). Manz (1986) has viewed self leadership as the influencing of one's self to perform tasks that may or may not be naturally motivating. It involves the adherence to superordinate standards that support the reasons for one's behaviour. It also involves self management strategies that facilitate behaviours which reduce deviation from standards. Torbert (1983) recognizes these self managerial skills as skills pertaining to the domain of the "Executive Mind" which he describes as an ability to cultivate timely actions that can effectively transform physical and social realities into the direction of desired purposes and ideals. Timely actions require knowing different scales of time, for example, one's own life time calling, the temporal patterns in one's organization, and the time scales of historical events. The Executive Mind is a particular talent that involves sensing and feeling. Other types of talents can be found in the Theorizing Mind which involves intuition and thinking, (the archetype of which is Socrates); the Passionate Mind that involves intuition and feeling, (the archetype of which is Jesus); and the Observing Mind that involves sensing and thinking, (the archetype of

which is Bhudda). Torbert (1983) has noted that all three archetypal leaders have been vision creators rather than vision executors and have had a sense of purpose, timing, order of things and have been open to influences of their followers.

Political skills have been recognized as another antecedent condition. For example, Kaplan (1985) found that the four top American educational leaders whom he studied had extensive experience in politics where they had developed tactical and diagnostic skills. Kaplan noted that these leaders had the extraordinary capacity to comprehend the changing rules of the game in education, to influence others and occasionally to dominate what was happening. In addition, they were perceptive of needs, knew what was right to do and how to mobilize the people and resources to accomplish the task. Cuban (1985) also noted that a wide range of political skills, in addition to teaching skills were needed for the present environment of the the superintendency which is characterized by increasing amounts of information, greater citizen involvement and weakened public confidence in government. These skills are necessary for communicating to subordinates the objectives, sense of direction and managerial tasks that are required for getting work done. Pfeffer (1981) noted that skill in the use of political symbolic language to manage meanings in organizations was a useful strategy that leaders often used to manage meanings in organizations, for example the firing of a sport's team manager to mollify the public if the team's performance did not measure up to the publicis' expectations.

Bass (1981), in a review of the literature of the 1970s on leadership traits noted that different leadership skills and traits are required in different situations, yet certain qualities such as courage, fortitude, and conviction may be common to leaders in different types of situations. He has noted however, that leaders need to be more competent than their followers and display the following characteristics:

> a strong drive for responsibiltiy and task completion, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesomeness and originality in problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other persons' behavior, and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand (1981: 81).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) studied 60 chief executive officers and 30 outstanding leaders in the United States. They noted that leaders are visionaires, strategists, individuals who are able to use and share power, encourage development in their followers, effective communicators, community builders, and confident individuals who can set standards and take risks. These leaders exhibited a concern for results and outcomes, and the ability to impart simplicity and clarity upon ambiguous and complex situations. These traits have been recognized by several researchers. For example, Rutherford (1985) investigated the leadership skills of elementary and secondary school principals and found that effective leaders exhibit five main abilities: (1) to develop a clear informed vision of what they want, (2) to translate their visions into goals, (3) to establish school climates that support progress toward these goals, (4) to monitor continuously progress, and (5) to support or provide corrective intervention when it is necessary. There is no indication of the relative importance of these characteristics to leaders, except that in a majority of leadership studies the ability to create visions has been identified as a basic precursor of leadership. Peters and Waterman (1982) have included coalition building as another essential characteristic of a leader as well as facilitating, cheer-leading and coaching abilities.

Quinn (1984) employed a Janusian perspective, taking into account conflicting and different aspects of the situation and identified eight core traits as essential to the leadership function. They are:

1. Process-oriented, diplomatic, and tactful traits which emphasize interpersonal skills,

2. Caring and emphatic traits which require people-oriented skills,
3. Traits of creativity and cleverness which emphasize conceptual skills,
4. Political and resource oriented traits which require sensitivity to external conditions,
5. Task oriented and work focussed traits which require an action orientation,
6. Decisive and directive traits which emphasize a planning orientation,
7. Dependable and reliable traits which emphasize predictability and skills in maintaining continuity and equilibrium,
8. Traits of technical expertise and preparedness which emphasize knowledgable skills and competence.

Both Bass (1981) and Yukl (1981) noted that the recognition of the salient role of personality traits and skills in leadership research does not indicate a return to the earlier trait approach which attempts to identify one universal set of leadership traits, but represents a useful alternative to the extreme situationally deterministic views that have developed in leadership research.

Several researchers have investigated the perceptual capabilities of followers and leaders. For example, Lord, Foti and Phillips (1982) undertook a study of individuals' perceptions of who is a leader from a non-leader. They found that among laymen the classification of leader was clearly distinct and dichotomous. Their theoretical framework was based on Rosch's theory of categorization (1978). The idea is that categories become associated with other categories and distinctive cognitive schemata develop. These schemata are defined as mental constructs that serve to systematically organize an individual's knowledge about persons or situations. These abstract categories serve as guides for the interpretation of information.

Foti, Fraser and Lord (1982) found that the mental categories whch people use in classifying what they consider to be leadership behaviour are guided by prototypes of who is or is not a leader rather than by behaviour that is observed directly and change with

political events over time (Phillips, 1984; Phillips and Lord, 1982). Moore and Beck (1984) found that bank managers continually refer to a global schema as a frame of reference in their decision making behaviour. These mental categories have been found to be hierarchically organized (Lord, Foti and DeVader, 1984). At the superordinate level is the global category of leader and below it are lower level categories of different types of leaders, for example, political leaders, military and educational leaders. At the lowest level in the hierarchy are the subordinate categories that further differentiate each basic level. They have shown that schemata which include prototypic representations of attributes and behaviours, such as leadership, shape individuals' perceptions, memory and inferences about different types of leaders.

Another type of schema is the script. It is a coherent network of structured knowledge, oriented around sequences of events that serve as a basis for action. It facilitates the construction of the meaning of events. Gioia and Manz (1985) have discussed how symbols and script schemata are used in making sense of events. Quinn (1984) conducted a theoretical study which can be associated with categorization in terms of script schemata. He argued that the social phenomenon of leadership, whether at the level of analysis of traits, behaviours or influence patterns reflects three core value dimensions: (1) control versus flexibility, (2) internal focus versus external focus, and (3) means or processes versus ends or outcomes. When these three value dimensions are arranged they describe four categories or "paradigms". Quinn's proposal is that individuals endorse one of the four "paradigms" more strongly than the others. Of the remaining three values, two are considered to be complementary paradigms and the fourth is evaluated negatively. The main limitation of this conceptual framework is the assumption of a one to one relationship among values, leadership traits, behaviours and influence patterns.

Information processing skill is another condition that is relevant to leadership action. A number of studies has shown that group members who get bogus feedback information

concerning a group performance tend to rate their group processes in a direction similar to the feedback they receive. This suggests that if a group is bogusly informed that its performance on a task is poor, group members tend to rate their group performances more unfavourably than others who receive bogus feedback indicating good performance. Researchers have attempted to investigate the conditions that bring about this feedback bias (Binning and Lord, 1980) and the cognitive processes that underly such bias (Binning, Zaba and Whattam, 1986). Current research in cognitive processes in information processing indicates that the judgments which individuals make concerning the performance of leaders are based on memory and a process of simplifying information through the classification of people and their behaviours into existing mental categories (Feldman, 1981; Lord, 1986). Findings from these studies have implications for procedures that are used in the development of instruments for measuring leadership behaviour. (Mitchell, Green and Wood, 1981; Mitchell and Wood, 1980; Staw and Ross, 1980) Attributional studies have been focussing on questions such as whether the quality of leadership performance is attributable to implicit theories of leadership that subordinates hold or to external causes; to what extent the amount of subordinates' control is related to the responsibility they have for the leadership performance; and whether the leader can expect consistency of performance over time. The notion is that the more a leader attributes the success of followers to internal factors such as ability and effort, and attributes their failures to external factors such as luck, the higher should be the leader's aspirations for followers' future performance. According to the self confirming principle, when followers' performances are inconsistent with the leader's expectations, the leader is likely to attribute that performance to external causes. Thus, studies of attributions of success or failure have been concerned with intervening characteristics such as empathy, similarity, liking, skill of the focal person in presenting believable, sincere, and adequate accounts of poor performance, and the attachment of positive meaning to failures. In general these studies have implications for the stereotyping of leaders as consistent persons.

Information processing theory and research have been used to explain individual's perceptions of leadership (Lord, 1985; Phillip and Lord, 1981). The explanation is that individuals hold implicit theories of leadership and stereotypes which tend to control their selection and attention to cues and as a result, the inferences they make, the cues that they recognize in their observations of leadership behaviour (Larson, 1982; Lord, Foti and Phillips, 1982). The significance of these informational processing approaches to leadership is their identification of intervening variables between situational cues and individuals' responses to leadership behaviour. Their findings have implications for the measurement of leadership behaviour.

The relevant components of motivation skills have been identified as the desire for power, competition with peers, achievement and successful results. Current studies have examined a diversity of motivational characteristics, for example, the fear of failure among leaders (Dapra, 1985), the influence of expectancy on leadership behaviour (Eden and Shani, 1982) and self-justification and impression management which produce bias and adjustments of beliefs to fit behaviour (Chatman, Bell and Staw, 1986). One area which has not received much attention from researchers is the leader's response to failure, that is, learning from one's mistakes (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). This deals with the leader's capacity to embrace positive goals and to be optimistic about extrinsic outcomes. It has been identified with the judgment of one's competence, innovativeness, future oriented thinking, and pragmatism. Skills related to emotional wisdom have also been recognized as leaders' attributes.

The power base of leaders has been viewed as a resource and a means that enhance their capacity for leadership action. In the current literature two strikingly different faces of power have received considerable attention. They are (1) the desire of the leaders to dominate and overpower followers by controlling, manipulating and keeping them weak and dependent on them, and (2) the desire of leaders to share and empower their

subordinates with power in order to build confidence and trust in the group. For example, in the area of interpersonal power the Machiavellian leader represents the manipulating and controlling type that preserves the development of a cult personality (Comer, 1985; Drory and Gluskinos 1980). Comer (1985) found that sales managers who scored highly on a Machiavellian scale, a measure of manipulative behaviour in dealing with persons in different situations exhibited significantly high external locus of control. Comer suggested that the manipulation of others may result not from a feeling of power but from a feeling of powerlessness and dependency. Drory and Gluskinos (1980), on the other hand investigated the difference between Machiavellian and non Machiavellian types of leaders on task performances and in group interaction. They found that individuals who scored high on the Machiavellian scale exhibited (a) a strong tendency to manipulate other people, (b) performed their tasks better than those who scored low on the scale, (c) had a better sense of timing than low Machiavellian scorers and were able to adapt their behaviour to changing circumstances, (d) initiated and controlled the structure, (e) manifested high levels of effectiveness under ambiguous situations, and (f) did not personally get involved in bargaining activities.

A blend of both faces of power is provided by the charismatic leader (Bass, 1985; Schwartz, 1983; Trice and Beyer, 1986. This type of leader is both domineering and sharing (Yukl, 1981). Bass (1985) notes that the charismatic leader provides inspiration to the followers who become unquestioningly loyal and devoted to their leader without regard to their own self-interest (1985: 35). Bass (1985), in a recent study extended the work of House (1977) on charismatic leadership. House proposed seven propositions pertaining to the essential traits, behaviours and contextual conditions that support charisma. These seven propositions covered observable and rational elements which, when collapsed, read as

follows:

> Charismatic leaders are likely to be dominant, self-confident, exhibit a need for influence, and a strong conviction in their own beliefs and ideals, which contribute to their followers' trust in their judgement.
>
> The more followers perceive their leaders to be magnetic, supportive, successful, or competent the more followers will model the values, attitudes, ideology, expectations and emotional responses of the leader.
>
> The behaviour of charismatic leaders creates impressions that they are competent and successful.
>
> Charismatic leaders are articulate and can communicate their ideological goals effectively to their followers whose roles are in turn defined in ideological terms.
>
> Charismatic leaders who communicate to their followers their high expectations for them and confidence in them are more likely to motivate followers to accept their goals and to obtain the followers' commitments to attaining them.

Yukl and Van Fleet (1982) and Bass (1985) extended House's propositions by adding an inspirational dimension. The propositions which Bass (1985) has offered are as follows:

Proposition 8: The charismatic leader reduces resistance to attitude change in followers and disinhibitions of behavioral responses by arousing emotional responses toward the leader and a sense of excitement and adventure which may produce restricted judgements and reduced inhibitions.

Proposition 9; The larger-than-life status of charismatic leaders make them useful targets of their followers' projections and catalysts for rationalization, repression, regression, and disassociation.

Proposition 10: Shared norms and group fantasies among followers facilitate the emergence and success of the charismatic leader.

Proposition 11: The charismatic leader may make extensive use of successful argumentation in influencing others and justifying his position. The charismatic leader may display superior debating skills, technical expertise, and ability to appropriately muster persuasive appeals.

Proposition 12: Analagous to thesis and antithesis, the very behaviors and qualities that transport supporters into extremes of love, veneration, and admiration of the charismatic personality, send opponents into extremes of hatred, animosity, and detestation.

Proposition 13: Charismatic leaders vary greatly in their pragmatism, flexibility, and opportunism.

Proposition 14: Charismatic leadership is more likely to be seen when groups, organizations, cultures, and societies are in state of stress and transition (1985: 56-59).

A central point that Bass has made is that charismatic leaders have the potential to be transforming leaders, for many of them have the abilities to perceive the needs, values and hopes of their followers. They also have the ability to articulate the goals and present themselves as miracle workers. They can arouse achievement, affiliation, and power motives among their followers and are able to generate frames of reference and construct a new reality for their followers. However, Bass has noted that leaders can be successful without charisma. Roberts (1985) has noted from an investigation of transformational leadership that charisma in the context of her investigation was an attribution made about the leader after the leader had exercised leadership in leading a school district through difficult financial times. Charisma, in this case emerged out of crisis and developed as the superintendent's

vision, mission, structure and transformational process developed. This finding suggests that charisma can be considered a social phenomenon, having structural and contextual properties and is not necessarily a phenomenon arising from unique characteristics of the leader or the leader's official authority.

Schwartz (1983) examined charisma from a different aspect. He sought to determine non-charismatic personal characteristics, by comparing the heroic leadership style of George Washington with the charismatic ideal type proposed by Weber. He found many differences between Washington's characteristics and Weber's charismatic type. First, George Washington did not possess any supernatural qualities, usually associated with charisma. Second, Washington did not have a magnetic personality nor did he accomplish any unusual military feat. Instead Washington was a formal leader who served as a military officer and a bureaucrat who espoused universalistic types of values, a characteristic which differed from the particularistic values of the Weberian charismatic type. Schwartz noted that George Washington was a type of leader who did not create the values and trends of his society but represented them. Bass (1985) and Little (1985) have noted that charisma develops under conditions of crisis and distress or a deterioration of traditional values.

Madsen and Snow (1983) investigated the leader-follower relationship in the context of charisma. They noted that the social construction of charisma depended equally on the magnetism of the leader and the "magnetizability" of the followers (1983: 338). A notable characteristic of followers of charismatic leaders is their acceptance of the leader's authority stemming from the belief that it is their duty to obey. Trice and Beyer (1986) examined the routinization of charisma into permanent and stable organizations, and made the following observations: First, charisma tends to fade without the support of a reinforcing culture with its symbolic actions, including ceremony and ritual. Secondly, the leader who succedes the charismatic has to be associated with the charismatic in order to retain the clear direction which is consonant with the charismatic mission. Thirdly, administrative

structures alone are not sufficient to hold followers of the charismatic movement together. Further structures for retaining the group are needed. Fourth, factors in a social situation together with organizational structural factors have an effect on the routinization of charisma.

The relevance of power to leadership has been an overriding concern of researchers in recent times. Burns (1978) has conceptualized leadership as a process in which leaders as holders of power and change agents, possessing certain motives and goals instigate and secure changes in the behaviour of followers and in the situational context by utilizing resources in their power base (1978: 13). Burns has noted that:

> To understand the nature of leadership requires understanding of the essence of power, for leadership is a special form of power (Burns, 1978: 12).

The main point that Burns makes with regard to power and leadership is that leadership is not merely an influential process but a power process. He notes that in the exercise of influence, unintended or unwanted changes may occur, whereas in leadership, change is intentional. This requires the exercise of power for achieving this task. It requires the leader to induce the followers "to act for certain goals that represent the value and the motivations -- the want and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers (1978: 19)". Leadership represents power in action. Leadership, from this perspective is allied with followers' needs and common goals. It involves the motives and resources of the leader and the followers and the relationship among them. Burns notes that the leader may or may not recognize followers' wants and needs or, if they are recognized, may recognize them only to the extent that is necessary to achieve the desired results. The issue, however, is that in the exercise of leadership, the leaders draw from the power bases of followers' resources that are relevant to their own motives. Thus, leadership "is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources

so as to arouse, engage and satisfy the motives of followers (Burns, 1978: 18)."

The conceptions of leadership that have currently emerged follows Burns' (1978) view that leadership is transforming and thus ultimately becomes moral, for it deals with the alteration of followers' needs and aspirations. Through interdependency in the leader-follower relation and relevant motivation, goals become realizable. Burns notes that leadership arises in conditions of conflict and competition in which leaders appeal to the motive bases of potential followers. Thus, leadership is relational, collective and purposeful like power but with a more limited range. Despite the differences that may exist between the leader and followers with regard to levels of motivation, power potential and skill, the main function of leadership becomes the pursuit of a common goal or purpose. The differences previously described have accounted for different types of interactions between the leader and the followers, but Burns has focussed on two polar types: a transactional type of leadership and a transformational type . In the former case, the interaction is based on an economic exchange of a cost-benefit nature. In the latter case, the interaction depends on a mutual exchange of rewards, the result of which is an elevated level of motivation and aspiration for both the leader and the followers.

Bennis (1984) continues this theme of the elevating face of power in his essay on the transformative power of leadership. He suggests that between the leader and the followers a participative and transactional relationship takes place that gives rise to empowerment: the capacity to harnass the collective energies of the followers for the accomplishment of the desired goal (1984: 66). In a later work, Bennis and Nanus (1985), note the neglect of systematic research in the area of power and leadership despite the recognition of its central role in leadership. They state:

> These days power is conspicuous in its absence. Powerlessness in the face of crisis. Powerlessness in the face of complexity. With contradiction and polarization of thought and action, power has been sabotaged while a kind of plodding pandemonium surges (1985: 6).

Bennis and Nanus view power as the force behind the initiation and sustenance of leadership action. Leadership, according to their conceptualization represents the wise use of power, which allows an organization to move from a current to a perceived desired state. Power in this context circulates as currency. In the hands of the leader it is power. Among the followers it is empowerment. It is this exchange of the leader's power for the followers' empowerment that gives rise to transforming leadership.

From these two major studies that have addressed the issue of power and leadership, several potential areas for empirical research have been uncovered. They include an assessment of the role of power in leadership contexts of the small group or department. Burns (1978) explored leadership as a mass level phenomenon. Bennis and Nanus (1985) on the other hand indicated that it can be transferred to small groups and organizations. The relevant question is whether transformational power in the form of leadership in small groups is analagous to transformational power exhibited at national levels. Bass (1981) has suggested that this is a potential area of concern for leadership research in the 1980s. Another potential area of research is in the dialectical nature of leadership. Since leadership is an aspect of power, it is concerned both with the particular values, motives, and definitions of reality that create resources and legitimate their use for certain purposes, and the exercise of power in ways that affect the power structure and thereby encourage the introduction of new values, motives and definitions of reality (Comstock, 1982: 147). This dialectical aspect of leadership is another area that requires systematic inquiry. For example, inquiry into the history of the leader-follower group may provide some insight into the contradictions and tensions that emerge in the structure of leadership.

Frost (1986) explored the theme of surface and deep levels of power in organizations where organizational actors attempt to accumulate and exercise varying amounts of power. He argued that power is shaped and influenced by the rules, structures

and content of communication at different levels of the organization and thus:

> ....new formulations of power, such as empowerment signals an awareness of an organizational game that has rules and intentions of empowering different from those envisages in many games where power is exercised in a more competitive, controlling manner.

Frost's warning is really that empowerment is just another game that leaders play and since games are competitive in nature, playing the game of empowerment can lead to the vulnerability and undermining of the players' positions.

Another view of power in the context of leader elites has been offered by Molotch and Boden (1985). They analysed the conversations that occurred among the American President and his men, as part of the 1973 Congressional Watergate Hearings and noted that three different faces of power complicated the communication process in the context of organizational politics. The first face of power was "the capacity to prevail in explicit contests." The second and less visible face was "the ability to set agendas, to determine the issues over which there will be any explicit contest at all." The third or hidden face of power was described as "the ability to determine the very grounds of the interactions through which agendas are set and outcomes determined (1985: 273)." These faces of power represented "power in action", that is power found within and throughout the existing structure, and "power in conception", power that permitted in explicit rational ways the self-interested intentions of political elites to proceed by establishing the groung rules for the process of interrogation. The notion is that individuals may use power to their advantage in organizational situations, including leadership. Another illustration of the subtelty of the use of power is captured in Kaplan's (1985:15) conclusory remarks on his study of American educational leaders. Kaplan noted that

> the lamentable absence of women, blacks, and Hispanics from the top of the hierarchy of leadership is a commentary on how real power .... transposes into leadership education.

Kaplan noted that the four educational leaders whom he studied were experienced in

politics and had the power to sell, install and monitor their ideas in their politically ridden organizations.

2. Leadership As An Action Process

Scholars have recognized that the structure of action underlies the social phenomenon of leadership (Burns, 1978). This has been demonstrated in the prolific use of action oriented terms to describe leadership. This descriptive terminology include terms such as movement (Bennis and Nanus, 1985), performance (Davis, 1984; Davis and Luthans, 1984), initiated change (Cunningham, 1985: 17), getting things done (Dachler, 1984: 101; Peters and Waterman, 1982) and behaviour that may be influencing, task-oriented, group-maintaining or representational (Yukl, 1981). At a more abstract level, action has been implied by perceptual behaviours such as shifting attention or orientation, cultural behaviours such as managing meaning (Pfeffer, 1981; Smircich and Morgan, 1982) and cognitive behaviours such as translating visions into action (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).

The common idea underlying these different descriptive terms is that leadership involves the expenditure of effort by a leader and followers in a situational context that provides the conditions for the attainment of a goal. This effort, however is interpreted within systems of meaning and thus can be viewed as a process that combines four classes of cultural components: (1) a value component which comprises conceptions of a desirable condition or state of affairs, (2) a normative component consisting of evaluative standards or rules, (3) a goal component comprising conceptions of the desired condition or state of affairs, and (4) a facility component representing the situation, the means for attaining the goal (Parsons and Shils, 1951). In the current studies of leadership, researchers have tended to examine only a single narrow aspect of leadership action (Yukl, 1981). A failure to achieve the integration of values, norms, goals and the context, that is the conditions for attaining the goals, in leadership studies has retarded progress towards the

development of a comprehensive understanding of leadership as an action process. Thus research on leadership action has developed as a compartmentalized activity.

Researchers have focussed on particular areas of action that meet their interests. For example, Pfeffer (1981) suggested that leadership action can be conceptualized as substantive action and symbolic action. Briefly stated, substantive action refers to the functional aspects of leadership, that is the instrumental actions and activities resulting from relations external to the leader-follower group. The symbolic perspective pertains to the interpretative aspects of leadership, that is the expressive actions that result from the internal cognitive processes of the individual. Some researchers have attempted to fuse both the substantive and symbolic aspects of action into their investigations. For example, Tushman and Romanelli (1985) investigated the intervention of leadership action on both the substantive and symbolic levels in the evolution of a cycle of organizational change.

The translation of leadership as substantive action in the literature has been reports of studies that emphasize social facts and actions. From the symbolic perspective, leadership is concerned with the explanation, justification and legitimation for actions which the organizational leader undertakes (Pfeffer, 1981). Researchers have commonly associated leadership with managerial activities. For example, in the report of an international symposium on managerial behaviour and leadership research, the terms, leadership and management were used interchangeably. (Hunt et al., 1984.) Thus it appears that the term "leadership" is redundant from this single perspective of substantive action. However from the symbolic perspective, researchers have shown that the term "leadership" is not a redundant concept for they use terms such as innovative manager, partmaster-craftsman, part artist, part designer (Bennis and Nanus, 1985) and statecraft (Duke, 1986) to capture the leadership experience. These terms offer some clarity but are insufficient. The term "leadership", thus appears to fit the special need to describe what is recognized as a particular ordering of experience for which no other word exists.

Other categories of leadership action that reseachers have investigated include task orientation, group maintenance, influence exchange and representational action; role related action which include interpersonal, information processing and decision making activities; actions pertaining to consideration and initiating structure; and from a behaviourist perspective operant and reinforcing behaviours. There is agreement among researchers that leadership is an action- oriented process that involves an exchange between the leader and the followers. But there is considerable disagreement about what is exchanged, how the exchange takes place and is conducted and what constraints take place in the process.

Leader-member exchange. Earlier research has found that the exchange process involves reciprocal influence processes between the leader and the followers. The leader may exert influence from his/her position and the authority vested in that role. This influence may include control over the administration of rewards and punishment, environmental conditions, the flow, amount and nature of information that is released to subordinates and the procedures that take place among the group members. The leader also derives influence from personal characteristics which may be physical, cognitive, and charismatic. These qualities include abilities to persuade and to inspire others. The influences of the subordinates, on the other hand are derived from various sources, for example, the leader's dependence on the followers, the organization of followers into coalitions and bargaining groups, the maintenance of access to selective information vital to the group and the development of strategies to cope with problems that arise in the leader-follower group. Current research has focussed on the reciprocity of these exchanges, in particular on the different kinds of exchanges leaders have with different individuals in the group. This approach is based on the Vertical Linkage Dyad Theory (Dansereau et al., 1973) a theoretical outcrop of role theory. Role theory asserts that the interpersonal exchange relationships determine in large part the type of role the followers play within the group. Recent studies (Dienesch and Linden, 1986; Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp, 1982; Scandura and Graen, 1984) have extended this theory in different ways. In these

studies, researchers have found that the vertical dyadic relationship, characterized by high levels of trust, interaction, support and rewards among in-group members and low levels of trust, interaction, support and rewards among out-group members is a stable phenomenon that quickly develops in groups. They have found that the Leader-Member Exchange model has utility in the measurement of actions of in-group and out-group members and the leader.

The Leader-Member Exchange Model has been used to determine the differences in effects between in-groups and out-groups (Graen, Novak and Somerkamp, 1982; Scandura and Graen, 1984; Vecchio and Godbel, 1984). A review by Dienesch and Liden (1986) suggested that progress in empirical research in this area is threatened by a number of methodological and theoretical weaknesses. First, the present theoretical basis of the model is too restrictive. Second there is no conformity in the operationalization of the concept, for example, items that have been used in the Leader-Member Exchange Scale have ranged from as few as two to as many as twelve items. Third, the unidimensionality of the scale does not have theoretical support. Dienesch and Linden (1986) have presented an alternative process-oriented, reciprocal-influence model of the leader-member exchange process. It is based on a multi-dimensional conception of reciprocal influence. The concept has been characterized in terms of the degree of trust and loyalty between the leader and the followers, their mutual influence and interpersonal attraction, and the competence of the followers. This area of research requires further investigation of a number of methodological questions pertaining to the development of the scale, theoretical issus pertaining to the nature of the construct, that is whether it is multi- or unidimensional.

Transactional versus transformational leadership. In this group of studies there is the dominant theme of an exchange based on the conceptualization of two ideal types. One involves the leader's exchange of rewards for the follower's services. The other involves an exchange in which mutual needs are recognized and exploited. The former

exchange has been identified with transactional leadership, whereas the latter form of exchange has been described as transformational leadership. These two themes have been explored in several studies or used as conceptual frameworks in a number of investigations (Bass, 1985; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kaplan, 1985; Little, 1985; Peters and Austin, 1985; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Quinn and McGrath, 1985). There are differences among these researchers with regard to their conceptualizations of transactional and transformational leadership. For example, Burns (1978) conceptualizes these two types of leadership as polar types along a continuum of power and motivation. Bass (1985) on the other hand does not make this distinction but conceptualizes leadership as involving both transaction and transformation. Leaders are viewed as exhibiting both behaviours, but in different degrees, depending on the situational context. Other differences exist in terms of the nature and the direction of the change that takes place within followers. Despite these disagreements there is common agreement that leadership involves exchanges between the leader and the followers in order to accomplish a perceived and articulated goal.

Burns (1978) has identified two basic types of leadership: the transactional and the transformational. He has viewed them as polar types along a continuum of power and motivation. In the transactional relationship, "leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions (1978:4)." Transactional leadership, thus inolved bargaining and calculations of cost and benefit in a market-place type of context. It concerns end values such as honesty, responsibility, fairness, and the honouring of commitment (1978: 426). For example, in opinion leadership which involves transactional exchanges between opinion leaders and followers, leadership involves initiating, triggering and catalyzing actions. Leaders seek to (1) arouse and mobilize political opinion, (2) aggregate opinion through a process of alignment, which involves organizing a large personal following, mobilizing support by socio-ecomonic class or using a political party, and (3) convert opinion by means of the vote. Election, therefore, represents a climatical phase of opinion leadership. It is the stage at which the

opportunity to convert realigned political support into power occurs. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, involves a "relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents (1978:4)." Transforming involves a unity based on the pursuit of "higher" goals. Both the leader and followers share a common purpose. This form of leadership concerns end values such as liberty, justice and equality.

Bass (1985) views leadership as a process in which both transactional and transformational exchanges occur. In transactional leadership the leader recognizes the followers needs and the actions the followers must perform in order to attain designated outcomes. The leader exchanges rewards and promises for followers' efforts, and attends to the followers' self-interests if they are perceived to be relevant to the accomplishment of the task (1985:11). In transformational leadership the nature of the exchange relationship is different. The leader arouses and alters the strength of needs of the followers, and raises followers' awareness of the issues of consequence (1985:17). This transformation requires a leader with vision, self-confidence, and inner strength to argue successfully for what he considers is right and good and to act symbolically when it is necessary to reconcile psychological contradictions that followers may experience.

For Bass, transforming leadership involves the following changes:

1. raising followers' level of awareness and level of consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes, and ways of reaching them,

2. getting followers to transcend their own self interest for the sake of the team, and

3. altering the level of the followers' needs according to Maslow's hierarchy or by "expanding their portfolio of needs and wants" (1985:20).

Bass (1985) differs from Burns in three ways. First, Bass adds the "expansion of portfolio of needs and wants" to Burns' raised needs of followers. Second, whereas Burns

sees the transformational process as necessarily elevating and involving good rather than bad, Bass views transformation as change in either direction. The important factor is the followers' attitudes and behaviour change as a result of the leaders' performance. Thus, transformational leadership for Bass is not necessarily beneficial. Third, based on empirical findings, Bass conceptualizes transformational leadership as a union of transactional and transforming behaviours, rather than as polar types as conceptualized by Burns (1978).

Leadership represents the shaping of organizational culture for Bass. More specifically, it involves the defining of a situation by a leader according to specific criteria and communicating the definition of the situation and the criteria used in its definition to the followers in an attempt to attain an objective. In cultural terms, the transactional leader accepts the organizational culture as it exists, that is the leader accepts the existing norms, conditions, beliefs, values, morality and ethics of the group and the self-identities as they are currently defined. The transactional leader uses the existing rituals and symbols belonging to the organizational culture to communicate its values. The transformational leader, on the other hand questions the existing organizational culture and invents and advances it by introducing new symbols in the form of beliefs, ideologies and cultural artifacts. The study of Peters and Waterman (1982) of successful American companies empirically support this conception of transformative leadership. They noted that leaders of these companies changed the organization's ideology by formulating and developing their ideologies in these organizations. For example, leaders, such as William Paley of CBS and James J. Watson of IBM were able to introduce and maintain their beliefs, values and ideologies in their organizations by utilizing a diversity of symbols and manipulating them to achieve their objectives. In this way they were able to shape their companies' policies. Leadership involved the communication of the leader's vision to organizational members and embedding it in the corporate culture.

Based on an empirical study of U. S. army officers Bass identified three components of transformational leadership - (1) charasmatic leadership which includes inspirational leadership, (2) individual consideration, and (3) intellectual stimulation. He also identified two components of transactional leadership: (1) contingent reward and (2) management by exception, that is intervening with negative feedback or disciplinary action when employee performance falls too far below the acceptable standards (1985:136). Bennis and Nanus (1985) outline a number of phases that comprise the transformative leadership process. They include: (a) the creation of a new and compelling vision, (b) developing commitment to the new vision and (c) institutionalizing it. The creation of a vision has been recognized as the force that is needed in leadership to move the group from a current condition to a desired future condition. Bennis and Nanus (1985) identified a number of activities that are included in the process: (a) creating a focus, (b) setting an agenda for the outcome, (c) attending and searching for information, (d) synthesizing the vision and choosing a direction, (e) focussing the vision and searching for commitment, (f) selecting a boundary for the vision, and (g) positioning the vision.

The phase of the development of commitment to the vision includes the following: (a) communicating the vision to the followers, (b) relating the compelling image of the desired state of affairs (the vision) to followers in order to induce enthusiasm and commitment in them, (c) organizing and mobilizing meaning, (d) inventing images, metaphors and models as means of providing a focus for followers' attention, (e) acting thoughtfully, (f) having reasons for one's actions, and (g) being politically astute in attempting to attract the attention of the followers so that they would listen to the idea.

Institutionalizing the new vision includes (a) managing trust through positioning, (b) maintaining constancy in focussing, (c) maintaining staying power and persistence, (d) inducing positive self-regard in members, (e) creating opportunities for organizational learning, and (f) using strategies to establish the vision. This process requires a leader who

is accountable, predictable, reliable and competent, thereby maintaining organizational integrity, creating in others a sense of confidence and shared ownership in the vision. This requires the exercise of power and control to obtain achievement of voluntary commitment to shared values.

The main studies which have been reviewed indicate a promising change of focus from the traditional area of inquiry into transactional leadership to transformational leadership. In these studies, to varying degrees the focus has been largely on the leaders. What is needed is an examination of the followers. Areas that could be investigated are the arousal of the followers, the extent and basis of the arousal, and the followers' readiness to act.

Roberts (1985) conducted a case study of a suburban school district and found that the transforming leadership of the superintendent involved a number of phases. Its source was a crisis brought about by retrenchment. From this developed a sequence of events which led to the articulation of the school distict's mission, the development of a shared strategic vision, and an ad hoc structure to deal with the required changes, a participative decision making process which involved different strata of people, and a skillful change agent in the role of superintendent. Roberts found that the skillful leadership of the superintendent during the period of severe legislative cutbacks and reduced expenditures for pupils, together with other district problems such as salary negotiations for staff and uncertainty whether the district could pass a levy to finance transport and summer school turned a potential disaster to an astounding accomplishment. Roberts (1985) conceptualized leadership not merely as management of meaning but as the creation and management of heightened energy that led to productive action. She noted:

> "It took energy to convince people that new ideas had merit and should be tested. It took energy to get them to trust (1985: 1043).

In these studies of leadership, researchers have recognized the exchange process as based

on mutual needs, aspirations and values and associated with the strong personal power of the leader which has been identified as charisma (Bass, 1985; Day, 1980; Galanter, 1982; House, 1977; Howell, 1986; Lodahl, 1982; Madsen and Snow, 1983; Schwartz, 1983; Trice and Beyer, 1986; Yukl and Van Fleet, 1982).

Leadership as Symbolic Action A steady flow of studies has developed in the area of leadership as symbolic action (Gray, Bougon and Donnellon, 1985; Moore and Beck, 1984; Pfeffer, 1981; Smircich and Morgan, 1982). This symbolic approach has added vitality to leadership inquiry. These studies have focussed on the interpretative aspects of symbolism which have been represented by studies of language games, texts and sense-making activities that leaders use in managing meaning in their organizations. The analysis of language games in leadership studies are based on the assumption that leadership action emerges from the reality-generating use of specific linguistic codes and practices. The metaphor of text is used to identify surface action within organizations. The idea is that leaders may use various modes of symbolic discourse to shape and formulate meanings in their organizations. In the 1980s the sense-making approach has received the most attention from researchers. As a result these studies will be examined in detail with specific reference to the seminal works of Bass (1985) and Bennis and Nanus (1985). The metaphor of sense making is used to focus on leadership as an on-going process of accomplishment. The notion is that through the sense making activities of the leaders and their attempts to create order, leaders engege in enacting processes. Morgan, Frost and Pondy (1983) note that the sense-making approach

> "encourages an analytical focus upon processes through which individuals create and use symbols; it focuses attention upon the study of the symbolic process through which reality is created and sustained.

Basic arguments that have contributed to the development of studies of the symbolic are: First, traditional studies of leadership have emphasized the concrete aspects of

leadership behaviour and have thus neglected the abstract and interpretative dimensions. This has presented an incomplete and overly descriptive view of leadership (Yukl, 1981). Second, an overreliance on correlational research methods has not been useful in providing causal explanations for patterns of leadership activity or in clarifying the various possible interpretations of significant correlations which have sometimes been found. As a result, researchers have adopted other approaches in their study of leadership. Thirdly, eclectic approaches to the study of leadership have overemphasized situational issues that support the possibility of a plurality of approaches, of which symbolism can be one.

Conceptions of the leadership process. Bennis (1983) has defined leadership as a process of "translating intention (a compelling vision) into reality and sustaining it (Bennis, 1983). Bennis and Nanus (1985) have elaborated on this definition by identifying specific phases of the leadership process, namely: the creation of the vision, the communication of the vision to others, and the institutionalization of the vision. The process involves envisioning which Srivastva (1983) defines as "creating in one's mind an image of a desired future organizational state that can serve as a guide to interim strategies, decisions and behavior (1983: 2). The vision has been equated with intention. Others have defined it as a goal that may be long-range or overarching. The vision, however, is a conception of a desired future condition or situation. Other labels for vision have been purpose, image, belief, direction, idea and mission. Despite the diversity of terminology there is agreement that the vision is the first step in transforming intention into reality.

Researchers have emphasized the central role of the vision in leadership, but few have pointed out the distinction between leadership involving the created vision from leadership involving the presented vision. The presented vision is found in the transactional type of leadership, whereas the created vision is found in transformational leadership. Kolb (1983) used the metaphor of the problem to discuss executive leadership that emerged

from presented problematic situations as opposed to leadership that developed from discovered problematic situations. The former type of leadership involves the use of routine procedures and focussed on control mechanisms. The latter type requires inventiveness and creativity and focusses on substance. A competing view of leadership, based on empirical evidence is that leadership involves the union of both routine and creative transactions (Bass, 1985). Bass recognizes these two aspects as part of the same leadership process.

What can be implied from Bass' finding is that leadership may involve the blending of the routine and the creative in certain situations. For example, in a situation where the leader is not aware of the vision but external others are, leadership action would require transactional exchanges as a first step in working towards the the discovery of the vision of which others are aware. This type of leadership may be conceptualized as a mid-point on the continuum that Burns (1978) has proposed. The extreme ranges of Burns' continuum are: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. The type of leadership process that has been described as involving both transactional and transformative processes would require more than the leader's acceptance of routine procedures and the presented vision. It requires executive reasoning, supplemented by the use of relevant information to move from the current condition to the desired future which is unknown and has to be discovered. Researchers who have used the culture metaphor have continued to make the distinction between different situations of leadership. They have distinguished leadership originating in organizational cultures that leaders accept as they exist from leadership originating in organizational cultures that leaders perceive to require change (Siehl and Martin, 1984). Likewise, in the context of beliefs, leadership has been identified with the shifting and formulation of organizational ideology (Nicholson, Ursell, and Blyton, 1981), and normative and goal beliefs (Peters and Waterman, 1982).

The vision. The vision has been defined as a conception of a desired condition or situation that is central to leadership. It aligns both the goals of the group

or organization with those of the individual toward a common end, a precondition for organizational success. There is general agreement that leaders create visions, communicate them and attempt to establish and institutionalize them. There is less agreement on how they undertake this task. For example, this pursuit has been explained by processes of creative envisioning, sense making, community building, symbol manipulating, reality transforming, opportunity or problem finding (Mitroff and Mason, 1983), experience framing (Torbert, 1983) and value imparting. These are areas that invite further inquiry. Srivastva (1983) notes that not much is known about envisioning and whether it is a natural ability that can be developed in those who have the potential for it. It is assumed to be related to the leader's ego and to be carefully devised to be successful. Bass (1985) has noted that the process of translating the vision can lead to different outcomes in the level of behavioural changes in the group. First order changes may occur as evidenced in the increases in the quantity and quality of performance, the substitution of one goal for another, a reduction in the resistance to particular actions and the contextual implementation of decisions. On the other hand, the second order changes that have occured relate to increased effort and changes in the rate in which the group's speed and accuracy are improved.

The main characteristics that Bennis and Nanus (1985) have been identified with creating a vision are: (1) the leader's conception of a desired future condition, (2) the leader's setting of an agenda for outcomes, (3) the leader's concentration on the vision, and (4) the leader's attention to followers. The model of man proposed by classical theorists and contemporary researchers (Dewey, 1910; Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi, 1976) of human thought processes supports the conception of the leader as an active agent in the leadership process. Their model conceptualizes man as a stimulus seeking and stimulus reducing organism whose need to explore and control is shown in common activities such as seeking mountains to climb (Cunningham, 1985), reading mystery novels, fantasizing opportunity and problem finding. These exploratory activities provide stimulation to the

individual and raise the level of the individual's excitement. This stimulus seeking model of man has been recognized for its appropriateness to the study of leadership (Bass, 1985), for it can be used to explain the exploratory drive of the leader and the creativity that results from felt tensions, and conflicts. Researchers (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Roberts, 1985) have noted that the sources of tension have concrete locations in the complex, conflicting and ambiguous environmental situations, the uncertainty of trends, the intentions and visions of other policy makers, and the signals of impending change (Quinn, 1980).

Huff (1984) examined the leadership behaviours of the superintendent of a school district in the context of the superintendent's reformulation of a problem that was previously thought to have been solved and his establishment of a new direction in the problem reformulation. Huff made several observations. First, the reconceptualization of the school problem was triggered by an argument presented as part of an unrelated, short-term problem facing the school district. Second, the argument challenged the fundamental assumptions on which the original decision to close the school had been based. Third, the leader identified several alternatives which did not interfere with the decision making process. Huff (1984) noted that the process of reformulation continued throughout the analysis of the problem. The leadership task was to find a frame for the problematic issue and to use the frame to influence others. It is probably no accident that among the current most insightful studies of leadership are those that have focussed on the aspects of thoughtful exploration.

The search for information. Search behaviour has been identified as a component of leadership action. (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Kaplan, 1985; Mintzberg and Waters, 1983). Schwenk (1986) suggested that the way in which executives use information can influence the production of commitment from individuals to a course of action. He suggested that anecdotal information could cause bias in individuals' judgments by encouraging them to develop a heuristic of representativeness that can deflect the

individuals' attention away from other types of information. The provision of large amounts of information can lead to increased overconfidence in one's ability. The use of selective information can produce an illusion of personal control. In addition, if the executive's course of action is mistaken, biases may occur that can lead to escalating commitment of the individual to an entraping course of action.

Johnson (1985) and Quinn (1980) note that the nature and extent of the search for information depends on the level of cognitive complexity of the leader. This characteristic has been found to be essential to leadership action. The search involves examining research findings, paying attention to current trends. the development of new situations, scanning the environment for signs of potential opportunities or problems, determining long term trends and speculating on the intentions and plans of other actors. Pfeffer (1981) has noted that information can be used for the legitimation and rationalization of actions, which can secure subordinates' commitment to the action. He also notes that symbolic management may involve "restriction of access to some information while at the same time providing other, more controllable and more favorable data" (1981: 31). Kaplan (1985) has noted that the top educational leaders whom he studied all exhibited an "unceasing quest for information" in many different forms. Kaplan (1985: 14) has described these leaders as "human blotters who absorb every useful drop of knowledge that falls within range of their exceptionally retentive memories." These leaders have been reported to be extensive readers and listeners who are able to make unique connections among their daily diverse readings. They engage in informal networking among colleagues within and outside the field of education and share ideas and materials with them. They often consult with experts. From another perspective, Pfeffer (1981) has pointed out the significance of searching for information and sharing it. He has argued that since rationality is a value and since educational organizations socialize their members to learn from data and to explore and experiment and resolve issues rationally, when leaders turn to facts, analyses, and expert opinions, they develop a source of social power

and at the same time project it as a concentrated mode of choice. This demonstrates that their course of action is the most effective strategy for attaining the values with which individuals have been inculcated in their schooling.

Quinn and McGrath (1985) have developed a meta values model, a component of which dealt with different styles of processing information. They have elaborated on four ideal types of information processing that can take place in organizational cutures:

1. The rational information processing style. This style is characterized by individuals who are interested in short term activities with high levels of certainty. They have a need for independence and achievement and are able to analyse patterns of information and select an appropriate strategy based on a priori logic.

2. The developmental or adaptive information processing style. This style is characterized by individuals who prefer short term activities and low levels of certainty. They have a need for variation, risk, excitement and growth. They tend to be idealistic, future oriented.

3. The consensual or group information processing style. This style is characterized by individuals who have a preference for long term activities and low levels of certainty. They have a need for affiliation and mutual dependence. Their orientation is toward feeling, affiliation and consideration of the group.

4. The hierarchical information processing style. This style is characterized by individuals who are interested in long term activities with high certainty. They need predictability and security. They tend to be analytical and empirically oriented.

Researchers have not investigated the role of the influence of information on leadership action but Pfeffer (1981) has suggested that it is probably easier to influence people through informational means than through attempts to obtain consensus on preferences.

Use of criteria. Researchers have noted that differences exist in the criteria which leaders use in their search, selection and arrangement of information. These criteria are different evaluative standards that have been viewed as ranging from informed intuition to a detailed rational analysis of the system of collected data (Gill, 1985; Huff, 1984;

Pondy, 1983; Quinn, 1980). Pondy (1983) reported than a senior Vice-President in charge of a foreign currency operation for the Coco-Cola company, when asked on what basis he made his decisions replied that his decisions were based more on gut level feelings than on elaborate technical reports. Pondy (1983) noted that this executive's intuitive judgements were not based on ignorance of facts but on the system he had created of acquiring timely information which informed his intuition.

Despite the common agreement on the general use of criteria, there are differences among researchers with regard to the conceptualization of the criteria that are used. For example, Gill (1985) in the examination of administrative elites conceptualized criteria that administrators use along a continuum ranging from criteria based on intuition to criteria based on rational theoretical considerations. Pondy (1983), on the other hand offers a competing model in which the criteria that execitives use include the mix of intuition and rationality. This is an area of discrepancy that requires further empirical investigation. The body of research suggests, however, that consideration of the criteria which the leader uses is important to the leadership process for it serves as a basis for the rationalization of actions and the development of a social base of power. The rationalization can be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of a course of action for attaining the desired goal.

Synthesizing the vision. The synthesis of the vision has been viewed as a process that requires the consideration of multiple alternatives and their possible outcomes. Leaders are therefore required to have an overview of the situation, an in-depth knowledge of it (Mintzberg and Waters, 1983), the ability to aggregate the different types of information, the skill to handle the complexity, the ability to simplify the situation and to communicate it easily to the followers.

Synthesizing the vision has been found to result in the creation of a unique place for the vision that can accommodate the appropriation of the group's resources and capabilities. It also can lead to the establishment of commitment of the group to the

vision. The positioning of the vision as a result of its synthesis requires some justification. Peters and Waterman (1982) and Torbert (1983) have noted that executives seek for answers to "why" questions in the exercise of leadership. The strategies that have been associated with positioning the vision include: (a) keeping options open in order to accommodate flexibility in coping with the wide range of occurrences in the changing environment, (b) proactively planning to change the environment, (c) changing the external environment or establishing a new relationship between the external and internal environments. The importance of the synthesis of the vision to leadership is that it helps in the establishment of the vision by providing a clear focus for the group. The synthesis of the vision, however, has to be communicated to the members of the group if they are to share in the collective action of realizing the vision.

Communicating the vision. Both the amount and the efficiency of communication have been recognized as way of developing a set of beliefs which in turn can facilitate communication among other members of the group. Smircich and Morgan (1982) undertook an ethnographic study of the executive staff of an insurance company to illustrate the way in which leaders communicate and use symbols in order to manage meaning. Their study was based on four assumptions: first, that leadership is a social process; second, that leadership involves the defining of reality in a way that makes sense to those who are led; third, that leadership requires dependency between the leader and followers; and fourth, that leadership becomes a formal role when the rights and obligations of the leader to define the nature of the experience are institutionalized. On the basis of these four assumptions they developed a model of leadership consisting of (1) the framing experience, which the action of the leader to create a focus of attention on conceptions of desirable ends; (2) the interpretative process, which is the symbolic action of the leader to get individuals to orient themselves to the attainment of the desirable ends; and (3) the meaningful action process, which is the establishment of the followers' interpretation of the leader's actions. The leaders that were studied had a

thorough knowledge and understanding of their organizations and were thus able to use appropriate tools for creating the understanding, participation and shared ownership of the vision.

Siehl and Martin (1984) investigated two forms of communication that managerial leaders used to communicate values -- explicit forms and implicit forms. The explicit forms of communication were quantitative data, statements of policy, rules and procedures and the orientation session held for new managerial staff. These forms were used in order to avoid misunderstandings and differences in interpretations. The implicit forms of communication were jargon, humour, role modelling, special language, stories and ritual. They noted that both forms of communication were useful in communicating values. Particularly noteworthy was the use of the cultural strategy of a formal training program to communicate the company's values.

Kaplan (1985) noted that the top four leaders he studied were skilled communicators. They were "expressive, and fluent public speakers who liked to write their own speeches. They knew their subject matter thoroughly." Quinn (1980) also noted the effects of communication to organizational members. He reported that when executives shared ownership of definitions of solutions to anomalous conditions, it prevented premature closure of the solution and facilitated options for the redefinition and reinterpretation of events, which were kept open. Pondy (1983) describes this sequence of events as "solidifying progress" (1983: 184), for it involves correct timing, verbalizing goals and themes and also engaging in symbolic acts. Pondy (1983) illustrates this communication aspect of leadership in the example of a university President who backed up his talk about budgetary caution with an announcement of the allocation of 2.5% budget cuts. Pondy noted that the timing of the symbolic act as well as the act served as a signal to the university community. Pondy noted that effective communication ended the preliminary phase of strategic change and marked the beginning of the solidification of a new

synthesis (1983: 185). Mintzberg and Waters (1983) came to similar conclusions from their case studies of entrepreneurial leaders.

Communicating the vision has been associated with the building of a community of shared beliefs values and interpretations. Through communication leaders get the support of their followers and the support of other multiple constituencies, including stakeholders (Bennis, 1983; Mitroff, 1984). A competing view is that communication need not result in the building of shared meanings in order to contribute to organized action. Donnellon, Gray and Bougon (1986) have provided empirical evidence to show that through communication, members of an organization may not share meanings but may develop a "socially shared repertoire of communication mechanisms" that facilitate collective action. The idea is that through communication, forms develop for sustaining interpretations of the group's experience and for coordinating actions. In this type of situation, members may have different reasons for undertaking the action and different interpretations of the potential outcomes of the action. Bennis and Nanus (1985) have noted that the use of power and the alignment of the group with other relevant contexts are the main benefits of communicating the vision.

These studies have implications for understanding the complexity involved in the communication of the leader's vision to the followers. A caution which scholars have issued is that the communication involves an interaction with followers who make implicit judgments of leadership behaviour and whose subjectivite meanings of the situation can have an effect on the leaders' actions.

Community building. Building the community depends on shaping the culture of the group, that is manipulating the symbols and meanings that are shared by the group. A more concrete definition has been offered by Siehl and Martin (1984). They defined culture as consisting of content, forms and strategies (1984: 228). Thus, the leader's task in building a community requires the development of a shared sense of

belongingness among individuals. This requires attending to the codes that exist in the group.

Parsons (1951) has defined a code as a normative frame of reference within which meanings are symbolized. It prescribes the rules for which behaviour becomes normatively acceptable. Shaping the culture of the group involves providing the followers with a context and an opportunity for their commitment to the context. It involves developing a commitment to the primary values of the group or organization, paying attention to the followers' history and the origin of the group. Siehl and Martin (1984) have noted that the development of an organizational culture serves four functions. First, it develops among members an identity and an awareness of how they should behave. Second, it generates excitement and a sense of community and self worth because the members come to believe in what they were doing. Third, it creates and maintains boundaries, thereby giving rise to community feelings of "we" as opposed to "they". Fourth, it serves as a control mechanism for some patterns of behaviour are prohibited.

Other researchers have questioned the emphasis of the influence of the leader in this regard. For example, Martin, Sitkin and Boehm (1985) have argued that the influence of the leader's role in establishing a community is constrained by several factors. First, leaders are not the only ones who develop values, understandings and behavioural norms. Second, there are other inflences that compete with and even have a greater influence than that of the leader, for example organizational constraints and external factors such as major changes in the environment, the nature of the task and the technology that members use. Third, social cognitive biases such as salience and attribution contribute to the distortion of members' perceptions of the leader's impact on events.

In leadership studies, a diversity of tools that leaders use in building the sense of community in their groups has been identified. These tools include symbols such as language, stories, ceremonies, games and rituals. Impression management and image are

other means that leaders have used in managing meaning in their groups. Gray, Bougon and Donnellon (1985) have proposed a phenomenological based conceptual framework for use in exploring the construction and destruction of meaning that occur as a result of leadership. They have noted that the use of meaning depends upon conceptions, the causal relationships between these conceptions, and the value by which the individuals connect the related conceptions to him/herself. Thus in an organizational context, meaning could be represented by cognitive maps based on the mapping of individuals' conceptions and the causal relationships between them (Weick and Bougon, 1986). Gray and his colleagues recognize the central role of leadership in defining the reality of the organization and engineering its consensual acceptance,but they also note that organizations contain the presence and absence of shared meaning. According to their model, shared meanings are present when the leader's system of meaning is accepted. When it is questioned and rejected in favour of contradictory meanings (due to the leader's abuse of power, or environmental pressures such as a major transformation or an environmental contingency or the mobilization of contradictory views) factors may result that combine to change the prevailing meaning of the community. Part of the leadership role is thus to manage these contradictions to shared meanings.

Language has been identified as a subtle and powerful tool of social influence that can be used to develop a common identity (Pondy, 1978: 91). Peters and Waterman (1982) have provided numerous illustrations of a number of successful companies in which logos have been used to build and maintain a shared sense of identity with the leader's vision for that organization. Research has shown that language provides a catalyst for focussing and orienting individual's interests (Pfeffer, 1981). Language has been used as a signal to get followers' attention to aspects of the situation which require action. Language has also been used as a symbol to excite, motivate and serve as a ritual in organizations. Pfeffer (1981) has noted that language is a vehicle for the rationalizing activity of an organization. As such, it is a substitute for the use of raw power. He quotes Edelman

(1964: 114) who states: "Force signals weakness in politics, as rape does in sex. Talk on the other hand involves a competitive exchange of symbols, referential and evocative, through which values are shared and assigned and coexistence attained" (Edelman, 1964: 114, as quoted in Pfeffer, 1981: 25)".

Leadership styles. The role of the leader in this process of building the community has been described in several ways, including the manager of meaning (Pfeffer, 1981; Smircich and Morgan, 1982), the craftsman (Duke, 1986), social architect (Bennis and Nanus, 1985); the culture transformer (Quinn, 1984; Quinn and McGrath, 1985). These metaphors have one theme in common, the theme of the transformer or developer. Bennis and Nanus (1985) have viewed leadership as an intervention to new organizational problems and complexities that can not be solved without guidance. Leadership, thus requires vision and power in order to carry out the transformation of the organization. Bennis and Nanus (1985) note that leaders have different styles in moving an organization or group from a present state to a future desired state. They have identified three styles according to the type of organizational culture and the nature of the interaction that occurs between the leader and the members. The formalistic style of leadership can be equated with the transactional type of leadership identified by Burns (1978). Leadership in this formalistic type of culture involves an hierarchical and structured relationship between the leader and members of the organization. Rules, rewards and punishments are the main forms of control of members and the decisions are based on authoritative direction. This type of organization corresponds to Weber's rational and legal authoritative type of group. Little (1985) describes leadership in a similar type of group in which the relationship between the leader and the followers is structured. The leader perceives himself/herself to be in competition with the followers. Little descibes this group as one in which the leader identifies himself as versus the followers.

The second type of leadership style is the collegial type of leader who operates among members as a peer member of the group. Decisions are based on agreement and interpersonal group commitment is the dominant form of control. The criterion for performance is consensus. A Weberian description of this type of group is one in which traditional and patrimonial authority exit. Little (1985) describes leadership interactions in this type of group as group oriented. The ties between the leader and followers are based on sentiment and affiliation. In this type of group followers looked for security and social connections. Quinn and McGrath (1985) describe an organizational culture that can be placed into this second group. Quinn and McGrath describe the leader of this type of group as concerned and supportive. The underlying motives of the group is affiliation. Cohesion is the main criterion of the group's performance.

The third type of leadership style that Bennis and Nanus (1985) identify is the personalistic style which is congruent with the transformative style of leadership descibed by Burns (1978). Under this personalistic style of leadership, the leader's decisions are made on the basis of internal directives. The prevailing form of control is alignment with one's self conceptions. The leader and members are related to one another as individuals, thus the relationship is individual oriented and actions are carried out on the basis of awareness of one's self. This type of organizational culture can be compared with Weber's charismatic type which is based on a personalistic type of authority. Little (1985) decribes this type of leadership interaction as one in which the ties between leader and followers are based on charisma and artful communication. Little describes the leader of this type of group as an inspiring leader who has exemplary self assurance, vision and optimism, and is concerned about image making. The followers seek to expand ideas and see themselves exemplified in the leader. Quinn and McGrath (1985) describe an ideological oriented group that can be placed in this third category. In this group authority is based on charisma. Power is based on values to which the group ascribes. The main point however is that despite the different styles of leadership exhibited in these different types of groups, the main

components of leadership include the creation of visions, their installation with the commitment of members to change and adopt a new culture and the employment of strategies in the organization to mobilize and focus followers' energies and resources.

Despite the leader's style of building the sense of community for the fulfilment of their objectives, the culture building function serves to overcome resistance to change by the exercise of power and control and by achieving voluntary commitment to shared values. It aligns the needs of varying stakeholders (Mitroff, 1984) and establishes an appropriate set of ethics or norms that govern people's behaviour. In the process of building a sense of community leaders obtain feedback which provides a learning experience. Some leaders have also been cited as creators of opportunities for learning in the translation of the vision into reality (Argyris, 1983; Bennis and Nanus, 1985). In the next section current issues surrounding learning and leadership are examined.

Learning and Coping with Feedback. Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Kolb (1983) have considered aspects of learning that takes place in response to feedback from the environment and the anticipation of potential changes. Leadership has been recognized as a means for promoting learning: (1) maintenance learning, which involves the acquistion of rules for dealing with presented problematic situations, and (2) innovative learning which is proactive and focusses on anticipation for action in new and changing situations. Leadership has been found to foster organizational learning by its provision of a focus for learning to take place and a model of learning as exemplified by the leader. Kolb (1983: 143) views this learning as a dialectical process involving

> valuing and priority setting in situation analysis, information gathering and problem definition in problem analysis, idea getting and decision making in solution analysis, and participation and planning in implementation analysis.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) note that their sample of American leaders created opportunities for their followers to learn and grow. Leadership from their perspective functioned as a

stimulus for learning. It reinforced and rewarded strategies for learning. A number of areas that have been identified from the literature as a stimuli for learning includes: (1) giving rewards in the form of recognition of services, promotion to increased responsibilities and encouragement in creative ventures, (2) reinforcing creative, innovative and long-range thinking, (3) encouraging and authorizing active experimentation (Kolb, 1983), (4) promoting talent and excellence, and (5) encouraging the development of conceptual and analytical thinking.

3. Outcomes of Leadership

Studies of leadership effectiveness have dealt largely with the outcomes of leadership action. The outcomes have been viewed as characteristics, either resulting from leadership actions (final outcomes) or intervening between leadership actions and its final result. The final outcomes pertain to the accomplishments of the group, the performance of the group, the translation of the vision into the realized goal, the establishment of the capabilities that develop in the process of attaining the goal, and the psychological growth that takes place among group members. The intervening outcomes represent an eclectic grouping of characteristics.

Yukl (1981: 270) has developed an integrating framework in which he has identified seven intervening characteristics. They are: (1) subordinate effort and commitment, (2) subordinate skills, (3) task-role organization, (4) group cohesiveness and teamwork, (5) subordinate role clarity, (6) leader-subordinate relations, and (7) support services and resources. This area of intervening characteristics of leadership effectiveness has received little attention in the current research, despite earlier recognition of their usefulness as indicators of leadership effectiveness in situations where the final outcomes of leadership action cannot be accurately determined (Likert, 1961; Yukl, 1981). The main concern of these studies, however, is not clarification of the conceptualization of what leadership is

but rather exploration of the nature of the effects of leadership, commonly referred to as leadership effectiveness. This clearly eliminates their consideration in this review of the literature.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Leadership development has been approached in two main ways: (1) the selection of potential leaders, and (2) training for leadership.

1. Selection

The trait approach has been closely associated with the selection of personnel for leadership positions. The notion is that individuals who can exhibit leadership traits and skills should be given the opportunity for their assessment in order that excellent standards be maintained in the selection of leadership personnel. The vehicle that is currently popular in the literature is the Assessment Center. This Center is used for assessing the skills and traits of individuals for leadership positions as well as for analysing the nature of the leadership position that may be vacant and the traits and skills that are most relevant for it. Reports in the National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin indicate that the Assessment Center has been very useful and successful in identifying individuals with high leadership potential and in developing and improving leadership behaviours of its participants (NASSP, January, 1986). For example, in the January issue of the NASSP Bulletin (70: 1-58) a large section was devoted to the establishment of an Assessment Center, the development and implementation of the Master Plan, and a discussion of the evaluation of the programs that are conducted in these newly established Centers in the Eastern United States. In these Centers a variety of projective tests and evaluation measures are used to assess the individual's potential for leadership postions. Reports have indicated that the Assessment Centers have been successful in improving administrative selection and decision making with regard to the promotion of personnel to leadership positions.

2. Training For Leadership

The majority of the literature is on the training for leadership. There are two dominant issues in training for leadership, which stem from the dual nature of leadership, as substantive and symbolic action. The salient question then is, If leadership involves symbolic action then training should be in the development of symbolic skills, such as language, acting and political skills rather than in managerial technical skills. But there is another issue. There is a lack of clarity in the conceptualization of what aspects of management belong to the leadership domain. As a result the premises underlying programs for leadership development and the actual programs that are offered vary in scope, quality and quantity. There is agreement on very general issues, for example leadership requires skills for developing creativity, conceptual, logical and analytical ability. Some studies have also shown that the ability to manage ambiguity, conflict, complexity, and uncertainty are important to leadership development. Other training programs have emphasized interpersonal skills. But scholars admit that training or experience in a particular functional discipline cannot guarantee that an individual will develop the requisites for functioning as a leader (Srivastva, 1983: 300). Yet, training is undertaken in leadership centers with the objective of transmitting skills that can aid in the developing of others, the management of self and the management of tasks.

Reflecting on the stimulus seeking model of man, proposed by motivation theorists, leaders are conceptualized as vision creators, opportunity explorers and problem finders. Thus a first requisite for the consideration of leadership training is that leaders will have to want to lead (Cunningham, 1985: 18). This view is counter to the view of the past that leaders emerge. Cunningham notes that a reliance on emergence is insufficient and that this is being recognized in several American communities. He makes several important observations. First, the literature on what is known about leadership can be helpful in training potential leaders. Secondly, because of the bombardment of targeted skill

development materials from entrepreneurs, great care should be taken in the assessment of the credentials of the trainers who conduct these popular training programs and the underlying premises of their work. Thirdly, attempts to continue relating research on leadership to skill development should continue with the use of diagnostice tests, designed to foster self-understanding. Fourth, since goal related activities are central to leadership, any program for leadership development should emphasize understanding the functions of individual and institutional goals and objectives (1985: 18). Cunningham (1985: 18-20) identified a set of skills that could be useful in leadership training: (1) focusing on the present and the future simultaneously, (2) bridging the gaps between different interest groups, (3) scanning, monitoring, and interpreting events, (4) appraisal skills, (5) intuition, (6) managing symbols, and (7) "the ability to communicate belief and perspective with clarity, conviction, and simplicity" as a teacher would.

The failure of management education to promote conditions that encourage leadership has received much attention recently. For example, Fry and Pasmore (1983) have pointed out that a possible reason for the failure of management education to promote conditions that would encourage leadership is the mismatch between the stage of formative development of young executives and the kind of education that is provided. Their argument is that training of potential leaders is needed most during their formative years when they are most open to influence from others.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) have discussed on the basis of their study of leaders, the implications of four stratagies for management education. They conclude that a major problem lies in the skills that are taught in management education. These training programs emphasize the acquisition of technical skills for solving structured programs, whereas leadership skills are required for working in complex and ill-structured problem situations. The distinction that they make is that management education caters to procedures and the routine while leadership education should cater to developing creative abilities for

functioning in new situations. Bennis and Nanus (1985) have identified four main strategies for leadership development: (1) managing attention through vision, that is creating a focus, (2) managing meaning through communication with followers, the building of trust and confidence in the community, inventing ways of influencing and organizing meaning among the followers, (3) managing the establishment of trust through thoughtful implementation of the vision, and (4) managing self. These researchers have also identified specific common beliefs about leaders and leadership as myths which impede the redirection of thinking about leadership training.

Johnson (1985) has identified six areas in which training for leadership can be provided. They include: (1) learning about creating, (2) communicating a vision of the future, (3) coaching subordinates, (4) facilitating their work, (5) building networks and coalitions of people in other departments and (6) learning how to deal with ambiguity and to adapt to change. Based on these six characteristics he has developed a program consisting of three modules. The first module is based on the assumption that leadership is proactive and responsible for promoting proactive skills, thereby the module promotes career resilience. The second and third modules are based on the assumption that leadership is learning about oneself and the environment. Johnson has translated the idea into two modules, one for the development of career insight and the other for the development of career identity.

Johnson (1985: 185) has not made a distinction between management and leadership for he views every manager as a leader to a certain degree. His argument is that managers who work in complex environments require iniative and independent action, thus the manager has to be a successful leader. In order to promote career resilience, Johnson has advocated five activities, related to the exposure of young managers to responsible positions, for example, from sitting on a junior board to attending assessment centers for the assessment of higher level skills. To develop skills for promoting career

insight, Johnston has suggested a number of workshops on human relations and personal awareness, in addition, to assessment and feedback analyses and the promotion of keeping journals and participating in outdoor programs. These activities have been designed to promote the development of clear, realistic and flexible goals, an understanding of the individual's strengths and weaknesses, and the social and political environment of the organization. The third module for career identity has been designed to encourage individuals in envisioning the future. Activites, such as engaging in computer conferencing, which accomodates exchanges of new perspectives and taking sabbaticals are encouraged.

Although leadership development studies have been emphasizing the need for creative thinking among leaders, the traditional focus on the managerial aspect of leadership has been maintained. It requires the development of skills related to planning, initiating, controlling, supporting, informing, and evaluating. Adair (1984) has developed an action centred course for leaders, designed to promote technical competence, knowledge to cover the "technical" aspects of management and ability to obtain action from those who are responsible and accountable.

Another current view that has developed with regard to leadership training is that followers are a significant element in the transformative process of leadership and therefore it seems wise that followers should be trained to select wise and able leaders who take their followers' interests and needs into account. As a result of this thinking, Lippitt (1982) has suggested a number of areas in which leadership development can be restructured so that the changing leader-follower relationship is taken into account. One area is in strengthening the role of the followers by training them to function effectively in a group and to develop norms and expectations that support the leadership function. A second development that he has identified is the development of leader-follower evaluations. The idea is that the joint shared evaluation is in the interest of the group. A third point that Lippitt (1982) makes is the utilization of joint techniques of reviewing the group's process

so that data concerning the progress of the group become disseminated and any blockage to communication and effective interaction can be identified, thus leading to improved working relations and productivity. In summary, Lippitt sugggests training for followership and productivity.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest that the new leader "commits people to action" an idea which is congruent with Lippitt's proposal. Bennis and Nanus note that a majority of people possess leadership skills but only a minority use them. The idea is that leadership is not a phenomenon that appears at the national level but also at the level of the small group or department. Leadership involves teaching process, for the leader acts as a teacher by "positing situations that pose hard moral choices and then encouraging conflict and debate" (Burns, 1978: 449). Leadership development in this context is helping the student to rise to elevated stages of moral reasoning and thus higher levels of principled judgement. This is an area which has been neglected in leadership development programs. It is noteworthy that, although there is lack of clarity in the conceptualization of leadership, programs of leadership training that have developed have focussed on ways of improving leadership effectiveness which have been found to alter and improve leadership performance.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Despite the diversity of studies on leadership, there are several omissions--due to the lack of systematic integration of the antecedents of leadership action with the leadership action process and its outcomes. A possible reason for these omissions is that most studies are narrowly focussed on a single set of components. Although diversity can be a healthy state for inquiry in the primitive stages of a field's development, in the case of leadership studies, diversity may be a reflection of different values underlying the studies. Some conceptual clarification is needed in order to to determine the nature of

the diversity and the direction in which inquiry should proceed, that is, whether inquiry should pursue a pluralistic mode or an integrated mode with the diversity of approaches serving to supplement comprehensive and integrative frameworks.

Some of the suggestions made by Schriesheim, Hunt, Hosking and Stewart (1984) in their summary of empirical and theoretical studies of leadership conducted by European and American researchers are pertinent to this conclusion. They note that leadership research is collectively moving ahead despite the diversity of approaches in the field and that there is a trend toward more exploration of broader conceptualizations of leadership. They note however, that the employment of the broad conceptualizations of leadership and the use of diverse data collection methods are more common among European scholars than among the Americans.

REFERENCES

Adair, J.
1984 The Skills of Leadership. Aldershot, England: Gomer Publishing Company.

Argyris, C.
1983 "Productive and counterproductive reasoning process." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates. The Executive Mind: 25-57. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B. M.
1981 Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. Revised and Expanded Edition. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M.
1985 Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Bennis, W.
1983 "The artform of leadership." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates (eds.), The Executive Mind: 15-24. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W.
1984 "Transformative power and leadership." In T. L. Sergiovanni and J. E. Corbally (eds.), Leadership and Organizational Culture: 64-71. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Bennis, W., and B. Nanus
1985 Leaders: The Strategies For Taking Charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Binning, J. F., and R. G. Lord
1980 "Boundary conditions for performance cue effects on group process ratings: Familiarity versus type of feedback." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26: 115-130.

Binning, J. F., A. J. Zaba, and J. C. Whattam
1986 "Explaining the biasing effects of performance cues in terms of cognitive categorization." Academy of Management Journal, 29: 521-535.

Burns, J. M.
1978 Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Calder, B. J.
1977 "An attribution theory of leadership." In B. Staw and G. Salancik (eds.), New Directions in Organizational Behavior. Chicago: St. Clair Press.

Chatman, J. A., N. E. Bell, and B. M. Staw
1986 The managed thought: The role of self-justification and impression management in organizational settings." In Henry P. Sims, Jr., Dennis A. Gioia, and Associates. The Thinking Organization: 191-214. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Comer, J. M.
1985 "Machiavellianism and inner versus outer directedness: A study of sales managers." Psychological Reports, 56: 81-82.

Comstock, D. E.
1982 "Power in organizations: Toward a critical theory." Pacific Sociological Review, 25: 139-162.

Cribbin, J. J.
1981 Leadership: Strategies For Organizational Effectiveness. New York: AMACOM.

Cuban, L.
1985 "Conflict and leadership in the superintendency." Phi Delta Kappa, 67: 28-30.

Cunningham, L. L.
1985 "Leaders and leadership: 1985 and beyond." Phi Delta Kappan, 67: 17-20.

Dachler, H. P.

1984 "Chapter 5 commentary: On refocusing leadership from a social systems perspective of management." In James G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership: 100-108. New York: Pergamon Press.

Dansereau, F., J. A. Alutto, S. E. Markham, and M. Dumas

1982 "Multiplexed supervision and leadership: An application of within and between analysis." In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran and C. A. Schriesheim (eds.), Leadership, Beyond Establishment Views: 81-103. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dansereau, F., J. Cashman, and G. Graen

1973 "Instrumental theory and equity theory as complementary approaches in predicting the relationship of leadership and turnover among managers." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 10: 184-200.

Dapra, R. A.

1985 Fear of failure and indices of leadership utilized in the training of ROTC cadets." Psychological Reports, 56: 27-30.

Davis, T. R., and F. Luthans

1984 "Defining and researching leadership as a behavioral construct: An idiographic approach." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20: 237-251.

Day, P. J.

1980 "Charismatic leadership in the small organization." Human Organization, 19 (1): 50-58.

Dewey, J.

1910 How We Think. Boston: Heath.

Dienesch, R. M., and R. C. Linden

1986 "Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development." Academy of Management Review, 11: 618-634.

Donnellon, A., B. Gray and M. G. Bougon

1986 "Communication, meaning, and organized action." Administrative Science Quarterly, 31: 43-55.

Downey, H. K., and A. P. Brief

1986 "How cognitive structures affect organizational design." In Henry P. Sims, Jr., Dennis A. Gioia, and Associates. The Thinking Organization: 165-190. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Drory, A., and U. M. Gluskinos

1980 "Machiavellianism and leadership." Journal of Applied Psychology, 65: 81-86.

Duke, D. L.

1986 "The aesthetics of leadership." Educational Administrative Quarterly, 22: 7-27.

Edelman, M.

1964 The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Edelson, M.

1976 "Toward a study of interpretation in psychoanalysis." In Jan L. Loubser et al., (eds.), Explorations in General Theory in Social Science: 151-181. New York: The Free Press.

Eden, D., and A. B. Shani

1982 "Pygmalion goes to boot camp: Expectancy, leadership, and trainee performance." Journal of Applied Psychology, 67: 194-199.

Feldman, J. M.

1981 "Beyond attribution theory: Cognitive processes in performance evaluation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 66: 127-148.

Feldman, S. P.

1986 "Culture, charisma, and the CEO: An essay on the meaning of high office." Human Relations, 39: 211-228.

Foti, R. J., S. L. Fraser, and R. G. Lord

1982 "Effects of leadership labels and prototypes on perceptions of political leaders." Journal of Applied Psychology, 67: 326-333.

Frost, P. J.

1986 "Power, politics and influence." In L.W. Porter, L. L. Putnman, K. H. Roberts and E. M. Jablin (eds.), The Handbook of Organizational Communication (in press).

Frost, P. J., L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, and J. Martin

1985 Organizational Culture. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Fry, R. E., and W. A. Pasmore

1983 "Strengthening management education." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates. The Executive Mind: 269-296. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Galanter, M.

1982 "Charismatic religious sects and psychiatry: An overview." American Journal of Psychiatry, 139: 1539-1548.

Gardner, K. G., D. M. DePalma, and T. R. Zastowny

1982 "Toward a comprehensive assessment of leadership behaviors in groups." Psychological Reports, 51: 991-998.

Getzels, J. W., and M. Csikszentmihalyi

1976 The Creative Vision: A Longitudinal Study of Problem Finding in Art. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Gill, A. P. P.

1985 Beliefs of Administrators about Problem Formulation. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of British Columbia.

Gioia, D. A.

1986 "Symbols, scripts, and sensemaking: Creating meaning in the organizational experience." In Henry P. Sims, Jr., Dennis A. Gioia, and Associates. The Thinking Organization: 49-74. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gioia, D. A., and C. C. Manz

1985 "Linking cognition and behavior: A script processing interpretation of vicarious learning." Academy of Management Review, 10: 527-539.

Graen,G., M. A. Novak, and P. Sommerkamp

1982 "The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30: 109-131.

Gray, B., M. G. Bougon, and A. Donnellon

1985 "Organizations as constructions and destructions of meaning." Journal of Management. 11 (2): 83-98.

Hall, R. H., and R. E. Quinn (eds.)

1983 Organization Theory and Public Policy: Contributions and Limitations. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Hosking, D., J. G. Hunt, C. A. Schriesheim and R. Stewart

1984 "Conclusions: On paradigm shifts in studying leadership." In G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership: 417-424. New York: Pergamon Press.

House, R.

1977 "A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership." In J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge: 189-273, Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Howell, J. M.

1986 Charismatic Leadership: Effects of Leadership Style and Group Productivity on Individual Adjustment and Performance. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of British Columbia.

Huff, A. S.

1984 "Situation interpretation, leader behavior and effectiveness." In James G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership: 253-262. New York: Pergamon Press.

Hunt, J. G., D. Hosking, C. A. Schriesheim, and R. Stewart

1984 Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership. New York: Pergamon Press.

Hunt, J. G., and R. N. Osborn

1982 "Toward a macro-oriented model of leadership: An odyssey." In James G. Hunt, Uma Sekaran and Chester A. Shriesheim (eds.), Leadership: Beyond Establishment Views. Carbondale: South Illinois University Press.

Hunt, J. G., U. Sekaran and C. A. Schriesheim (eds.)

1982 Leadership: Beyond Establishment Views. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Johnson, Manuel

1985 Developing Managers. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Kaplan, G. R.

1985 "Shining lights in high places: Education's top four leaders and their heirs." Phi Delta Kappan, 67: 7-16.

Kolb, D. A.

1983 "Problem management: Learning from experience." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates, The Executive Mind: 109-143. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Larson, J. R.

1982 "Cognitive mechanisms mediating the impact of implicit theories of leader behavior on leader behavior ratings." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 29: 129-140.

Leana, Carrie R.

1985 "A partial test of Janis' groupthink model: Effects of group cohesiveness and leader behavior on defective decision making." Journal of Management, 11: 5-17.

Likert, R.

1961 The Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lippitt, R.

1982 "The changing leader-follower relationships of the 1980s." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18: 395-403.

Little, G.

1985 Political Ensembles: A Psychosocial Approach to Politics and Leadership. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lodahl, London, M.

1985 Developing Managers. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Lord, R. G.

1985 "An information processing approach to social perceptions, leadership and behavioral measurement in organizations." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Straw (eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 7: 87-128. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Lord, Robert G., Christy L. De Vader and George M. Alliger

1986 "A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures." Journal of Applied Psychology, 71: 402-410.

Lord, Robert G., and Roseanne J. Foti

1986 Schema theories, information processing, and organizational behavior." In Henry P. Sims, Jr., Dennis A. Gioia, and Associates. The Thinking Organization: 20-48. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lord, R. G., R. J. Foti, and C. L. DeVader
1984 "A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing and leadership perceptions." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34: 343-378.

Lord, R. G., R. J. Foti, and J. S. Phillips
1982 "A theory of leadership categorization." In James G. Hunt, Uma Sekaran and Chester A. Shriesheim (eds.), Leadership: Beyond Establishment Views: 104-121. Carbondale: South Illinois University Press.

Loubser, J. L., R. C. Baum, A. Effrat, and V. M. Lidz (eds.)
1976 Explorations in General Theory in Social Science. New York: The Free Press.

Madsen, D., and P. G. Snow
1983 "The dispersion of charisma." Comparative Political Studies, 16: 337-362.

Manz, C. C.
1986 "Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations." Academy of Management Review, 11: 585-600.

Martin, J., S. B. Sitkin, and M. Boehm
1985 "Foundations and the elusiveness of a cultural legacy." In Peter J. Frost, Larry F. Moore, Meryl Reis Louis, Craig C. Lundberg and Joanne Martin (eds.), Organizational Culture: 99-124. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Mason, R. O., and I. Mitroff
1981 Challenging Strategic Planning Assumptions. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Massarik, F.
1983 "Searching for essence in executive experience." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates (eds.), The Executive Mind: 243-268. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

McCall, M. W., Jr., and M. M. Lombardo
1978 Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

McElroy, J. C.

1982 "A typology of attribution leadership research." Academy of Management Review, 7: 413-417.

Mintzberg, H., and J. A. Waters

1983 "The mind of the strategist(s)." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates (eds.), The Executive Mind: 58-83. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, T. R., S. G. Green, and R. Wood

1981 "An attributional model of leadership and the poor performing subordinate." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 3: 197-234. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Mitchell, T., and R. Wood

1980 "Supervisor's responses to subordinate poor performance: A test of an attributional model." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 25: 123-138.

Mitroff, I. I.

1984 Stakeholders of the Mind. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mitroff, I. I., and R. O. Mason

1983 "Stakeholders of executive decision making." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates. The Executive Mind: 144-168. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Molotch, H. L., and D. Boden

1985 "Talking social structure: Discourse, domination and the Watergate hearings." American Sociological Review, 50: 273-288.

Moore, L. F., and B. E. F. Beck

1984 "Leadership among bank managers: A structural comparison of behavioral responses and metaphorical imagery." In James G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership: 227-239. New York: Pergamon Press.

Morgan, G., P. Frost, and L. Pondy
1983 "Organizational Symbolism." In Louis R. Pondy, Peter J. Frost, Gareth Morgan and Thomas C. Dandridge (eds.), Organizational Symbolism: 3-35. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Nicholson, N., G. Ursell, and P. Blyton
1981 The Dynamics of White Collar Unionism. London: Academic Press.

NASSP Bulletin 70: 1-39
1986 "The principal as leader (Symposium)

NASSP Bulletin 70: 1-58
1986 (Discussion on the Assessment Center)

Osborn, R. N., F. A. Morris and P. E. Conner
1984 "Emerging technologies: The challenge to leadership theory." In James G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership: 360-365. New York: Pergamon Press.

Parsons, T.
1951 The Structure of Social Action: The Social System. New York: The Free Press.

Parsons, T., and E. Shils
1951 Toward a General Theory of Action. New York: Harper and Row.

Parsons, T., E. Shils, K. Naegele, and J. Pitts (eds.)
1961 Theories of Society. Glencoe: The Free Press. Harper and Row.

Peters, T., and N. Austin
1985 A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Difference. New York: Random House.

Peters, T. J., and R. H. Waterman
1982 In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper and Row.

Pfeffer, J.
1977 "The ambiguity of leadership." Academy of Management Review, 2: 104-112.

Pfeffer, J.
1981 "Management as symbolic action: the creation and maintenance of organizational paradigms." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 3: 1-52. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Phillips, J. S.
1984 "The accuracy of leadership ratings: A cognitive categorization perspective." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33: 125-138.

Phillips, J. S., and R. G. Lord
1981 "Causal attributions and perceptions of leadership." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 28: 143-163.

Phillips, J. S., and R. G. Lord
1982 "Schematic information processing and perceptions of leadership in problem-solving groups." Journal of Applied Psychology, 67: 486-492.

Pondy, L. R.
1978 "Leadership is a language game." In Morgan W. McCall, Jr., and Michael M. Lombardo (eds.), Leadership: Where Else Can We Go: 87-99. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Pondy, L. R.
1983 "Union of rationality and intuition in management action." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates. The Executive Mind: 169-191. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pondy, L. R., P. Frost, G. Morgan and T. Dandridge (eds.)
1983 Organizational Symbolism. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Price, K. H., and H. Garland
1981 "Compliance with a leader's suggestions as a function of perceived leader/member competence and potential reciprocity." Journal of Applied Psychology, 66: 329-336.

Quinn, J. B.

1980 Strategies For Change: Logical Incrementalism. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin.

Quinn, R. E.

1984 "Applying the competing values approach to leadership: Toward an integrative framework." In James G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership. 10-27. New York: Pergamon Press.

Quinn, R. E., and R. H. Hall

1983 "Environments, organizations, and policy makers: Toward an integrated framework." In R. H. Hall and R. E. Quinn (eds.), Organization Theory and Public Policy: Contributions and Limitations. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Quinn, R. E., and M. R. McGrath

1985 "The transformation of organizational cultures." In Peter J. Frost, Larry F. Moore, Meryl Reis Louis, Craig C. Lundberg, and Joanne Martin (eds.), Organizational Culture: 315-334. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Roberts, N. C.

1985 Transforming leadership: A process of collective action." Human Relations, 38: 1023-1046.

Rosch, E.

1978 "Principles of categorization." In E. Rosch and B. B. Lloyd (eds.), Cognition and Categorization. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Rosenbach, W. E., and R. L. Taylor (eds.)

1984 Contemporary Issues in Leadership. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Rutherford, W. L.

1985 "School principals as effective leaders." Phi Delta Kappan, 67: 31-34.

Scandura T., and G. Graen

1984 "Moderating effects of leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention." Journal of Applied Psychology, 69: 428-436.

Schön, D. A.

1984 "Leadership as reflection-in-action." In T. L. Sergiovanni and J. E. Corbally (eds.), Leadership and Organizational Culture: 36-63. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Schriesheim, C. A., J. G. Hunt, D. Hosking, and R. Stewart

1984 "Managerial behavior/Leadership perspectives: An international epilog." In James G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership: 384-416. New York: Pergamon Press.

Schwartz, B.

1983 "George Washington and the Whig conception of heroic leadership." American Sociological Review, 48: 18-33.

Schwenk, C. R.

1986 "Information, cognitive biases, and commitment to a course of action." Academy of Management Review, 11: 298-310.

Sekaran, U., J. G. Hunt, and C. A. Schriesheim

1982 "Beyond establishment leadership views: An epilog." In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran and C. A. Schriesheim (eds.), Leadership, Beyond Establishment Views. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Sergiovanni, T. L., and J. E. Corbally (eds.)

1984 Leadership and Organizational Culture. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Siehl, C., and J. Martin

1984 "The role of symbolic management: How can managers effectively transmit organizational culture?" In James G. Hunt, Dian-Marie Hosking, Chester A. Schriesheim, and Rosemary Stewart (eds.), Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on managerial Behavior and Leadership: 227-239. New York: Pergamon Press.

Simonton, D. K.

1985 "Intelligence and personal influence in groups: Four nonlinear models." Psychological Review, 92: 532-547.

Sims, H. P. Jr., D. A. Gioia, and Associates

1986 The Thinking Organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smircich, L., and G. Morgan

1982 "Leadership: The management of meaning." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18: 257-273.

Srivastva, S.

1983 "Introduction: Common themes in executive thought and action." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates (eds.). The Executive Mind: 1-14. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Srivastva, S., and Associates

1983 The Executive Mind: New Insights on Managerial Thought and Action. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Staw, B. M., and J. Ross

1980 "Commitment in an experimenting society: A study of the attribution of leadership from administrative scenarios." Journal of Applied Psychology, 65: 249-260.

Torbert, W. R.

1983 "Cultivating timely executive action." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates, The Executive Mind: 84-108. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Trice, H. M., and J. M. Beyer

1986 "Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations." In Barry M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 8, Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Tushman, M. L., and E. Romanelli

1985 "Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds), Research in Organizational Behavior, 7: 171-222. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Vecchio, R., and B. Gobdel

1984 "The vertical dyad linkage model of leadership: Problems and prospects." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34: 5-20.

Weick, K. E.

1983 "Managerial thought in the context of action." In Suresh Srivastva and Associates (eds.), The Executive Mind: 221-242. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Weick, K. E.

1979 The Social Psychology of Organizing. (2nd ed.). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Weick, K. E., and M. G. Bougon

1982 "Organizations as cognitive maps." In Henry P. Sims, Jr., Dennis A. Gioia, and Associates. The Thinking Organization: 102-135. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yukl, G. A.

1981 Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. A., and D. D. Van Fleet

1982 Cross-situational, multimethod research on leader effectiveness." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30: 87-108.